REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending. Claims 17-48 are withdrawn. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims.

The examiner uses Deluca to reject claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 8 as having been anticipated.

Applicant canceled claim 2.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "changing the first television program segment to a second television program segment in response to a user selection, the video screen comprising a window region continuing to display an indication of the first television program segment simultaneously in a main program screen with the second television program segment." Deluca fails to describe or disclose this quoted claim feature.

More particularly, Deluca does nothing in response to any user input. Deluca automatically and without user intervention, changes a first television channel to a second television channel upon a detection of an undesireable television commercial in the first television channel:

> In response to the detect signal, selector 20 deemphasizes the current program by terminating presentation of the undesirable program information and emphasizes an alternate program by substituting the alternate program information. Or more simply, one embodiment of the invention automatically changes the channel when a frame of an undesirable commercial is detected. [Deluca, col. 3, lines 3-9]

Accordingly, claim 1 is not anticipated by Deluca.

The examiner uses Montero to reject claims 11, 14, 15 and 16 as having been anticipated.

Claim 11, as amended, recites "providing additional signal information representative of the first video program to be displayed in a window on a video screen while simultaneously displaying information other than said second first video program in response to the input." Montero fails to describe or disclose this quoted claim feature.

Montero merely describes a technique and apparatus for delivering information to the subscribers (terminals) on a communication network:

> The information is simultaneously displayed without interfering with the reception and/or display of subscriber's selected data or program. [Montero, Abstract]

Accordingly, claim 11 is not anticipated by Montero.

The examiner uses Deluca and official notice to reject claims 3 and 6 as having been obvious.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "changing the first television program segment to a second

television program segment in response to a user selection, the video screen comprising a window region continuing to display an indication of the first television program segment simultaneously in a main program screen with the second television program segment." Deluca fails to teach or suggest this quoted claim feature.

Claims 3 and 6 depend upon, and further limit, claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3 and 6 are not obvious in view of Deluca.

The examiner uses Deluca and Shoff to reject claims 7, 9 and 10.

Claim 1, as amended, recites "changing the first television program segment to a second television program segment in response to a user selection, the video screen comprising a window region continuing to display an indication of the first television program segment simultaneously in a main program screen with the second television program segment." Deluca fails to teach or suggest this quoted claim feature.

Shoff describes a method of displaying information derived from, and displayed during, a current program, and not information regarding a previous program in conjunction with the current program:

> When the viewer tunes to a particular channel, the viewer computing unit consults the EPG to determine if the present program is interactive. If it is, the viewer computing unit launches an interactive support module, such as an Internet browser. This browser is kept in memory and is dynamically loadable for execution on the processor when the viewer tunes to a channel carrying a video content program that the EPG identifies as interactive. The viewer computing unit also depicts a small icon or other indicia to alert the viewer that the program is interactive. The viewer can click on or otherwise activate the icon to enter the interactive mode and display the supplemental content.[Shoff, col. 3, lines 14-25]

Accordingly, claim 1 is not obvious in view of Deluca and Shoff.

Claims 7, 9 and 10 depend upon, and further limit, claim 1. Accordingly, claims 7, 9 and 10 are not obvious in view of Deluca and Shoff.

The examiner uses Montero and official notice to reject claims 12 and 13 as having been obvious.

Claim 11, as amended, recites "providing additional signal information representative of the first video program to be displayed in a window on a video screen while simultaneously displaying information other than said second first video program in response to the input." Montero fails to teach or suggest this quoted claim feature and discussed above.

Claims 12 and 13 depend upon, and further limit, claim 11. Accordingly, claims 12 and 13

are not obvious in view of Montero.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 3, 2006

Kenneth F. Kozik
Reg. No. 36,572

Holland & Knight LLP
10 St. James Avenue
Boston, MA 02116
Telephone: (617) 573-5879
Facsimile: (617) 523-6850

3947144_v1